

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/739,637	12/20/2000	Aliza R. Heching	YOR9-2000-0613US1	4762
30743	7590 12/17/2004		EXAMINER	
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			JEANTY, ROMAIN	
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESTON, V	A 20190		3623	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	l ~
	09/739,637	HECHING ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Romain Jeanty	3623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address -	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communica ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ition.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 De	ecember 2000.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits	sis
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		_	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the one of the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrections.		, i	1/4\
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Ll Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	_ ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` `	Patent Application (PTO-152)	

This Non-Final Office Action is in response to the filing of this application on December
 20, 2000. Claims 1-7 are resent in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts of:
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, invoice, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

Application/Control Number: 09/739,637 Page 3

Art Unit: 3623

Furthermore, mere intended or nominal use of a component, albeit within the technological arts, does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea if the component does not apply, involve, use, or advance the underlying process.

While claims 1-7 produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result, they are deemed to be statutory for failure to apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts. In order to overcome this rejection, it is respectfully suggested that the claims be amended to expressly incorporate technology (i.e., a computer processor) as performing at least one of the steps of the invention (i.e., an analysis step. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 recites that the point estimates are constrained by a predetermined amount. It is unclear as to predetermined amount of what applicant is referring to. Clarification is required

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3623

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. As per claims 2-3, the combination of AAP, Zhu and Wire feed fails to explicitly disclose herein said selecting step is performed using probability sampling techniques. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the survey industry art to use probability sampling techniques and cluster sampling. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of AAP, Zhu and Wire feed to include a probability sampling techniques with the motivation to provide an efficient way to collect sample information, thereby reducing the complexity of computation of the sample estimates and their standard errors. In support of the Official Notice, applicant is directed to pages 2 of Carlin et al (Design of cross-sectional surveys using cluster sampling: An overview with Australian Case studies).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 09/739,637

Art Unit: 3623

- a. Rohrbach (Variance augmentation to achieve nominal coverage probability in sampling from audit populations) discloses confidence bounds in audit populations.
 - b. Cohen (U.S. patent No. 5,740,035) discloses a method for administer a survey.
- c. Fuerst (U.S. Patent No. 6189029) discloses a software tool for creating a survey.
- d. Hamlin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,477,504) disclose a method for conducting surveys over a network.
- e. Enviro (Wo9907144) discloses a method for electronically accumulating market survey data form interested users.
- f. Williams et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,391) discloses a method for predicting a customer's behavior based on analyzed survey responses

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (703) 308-9585. The examiner can normally be reached Mon-Thursday 7:30 am-6:00 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 3623

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3623

December 13, 2004